

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/829,583	04/22/2004	Hsuch-Chung Chen	252011-2240	6746	
47390 75	90 12/20/2005	EXAMINER			
THOMAS, KAYDEN, HOSTEMEYER & RISLEY LLP 100 GALLERIA PARKWAY SUITE 1750			ANDUJAR, L	ANDUJAR, LEONARDO	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ATLANTA, G	A 30339		2826		

DATE MAILED: 12/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/829,583	CHEN ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Leonardo Andújar	2826			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence addres	s		
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Faill	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be oly within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) of will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDO	timely filed lays will be considered timely. om the mailing date of this commur NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nication.		
Status						
1)🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/0	06/2005.				
,	<u> </u>	s action is non-final.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
4)⊠ 5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠ 8)□	Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-12 and 22-25 is/are rejected. Claim(s) 13-21 is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or ion Papers	awn from consideration.				
• •	·					
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examin The drawing(s) filed on <u>06 October 2005</u> is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examin The Specification is objected to by the Examin Theorem 1.	e: a) \boxtimes accepted or b) \square object e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). objected to. See 37 CFR 1.			
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureation and Description for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applicority documents have been received in Rule 17.2(a)).	ation No ived in this National Stag	ge		
Attachme		<u></u>				
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summ Paper No(s)/Mai				
3) Info	rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 er No(s)/Mail Date		al Patent Application (PTO-152	2)		

Application/Control Number: 10/829,583

Art Unit: 2826

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgment

1. The amendment filed on 10/06/2005 in response to the Office action mailed on 08/12/2005 has been entered. The present Office action is made with all the suggested amendments being fully considered. Accordingly, pending in this Office action are claims 1-25.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter that the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claims 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 4. Claim 22 recites the limitation "the plurality of bridges" in line 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- 5. Claim 23 recites the limitation "the plurality of power lines" in line 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- 6. Claim 24 recites the limitation "the plurality of power lines" in line 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

Art Unit: 2826

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

- 8. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-12 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kunikiyo (US 6,717,267).
- 9. Regarding claim 1, Kunikiyo (e.g. fig. 12) shows a semiconductor configuration for dissipating heat away from a semiconductor device having a plurality of power bus lines, comprising: a semiconductor substrate 1, and a plurality of interconnect structures (26a/b, 20a) disposed on the substrate and in contact therewith and extending through the semiconductor device, the interconnect structures for dissipating heat through the substrate wherein the plurality of interconnection structures are disposed within a power line 72/28A (col. 9/lls. 1-6 & col. 21/lls. 40-50).
- 10. Regarding claim 3, Kunikiyo shows that the each of the plurality of interconnects structures comprises at least one via stack.
- 11. Regarding claim 4, Kunikiyo shows that the plurality of interconnects structures are close to the power line.
- 12. Regarding claim 5, Kunikiyo shows that at least one of the plurality of interconnect structure (26a, 26b) is joined to one other of the plurality of interconnect structures using a bridge structure
- 13. Regarding claim 6, Kunikiyo shows bridge structures (the section of 28A that ioints the interconnections), each of the bridge structures joins a respective one of the

plurality of interconnect structures (26a, 26b, 29a) to one other of the plurality of interconnect structures.

Page 4

- 14. Regarding claim 8, Kunikiyo shows that the interconnect structures (26a, 26b) are spaced apart form each other by width of one of the interconnect structures (e.g. 29a).
- 15. Regarding claim 9, Kunikiyo shows that the plurality of interconnect structure (e.g. 26c and 26a) is alternatively spaced apart form a serpentine power line 25a by a distance (e.g. fig. 9).
- 16. Regarding claim 10, Kunikiyo shows that the distance is a width of one of the plurality of interconnect structures (e.g. 25a).
- 17. Regarding claim 11, Kunikiyo shows that each of the interconnect structures (21c) is spaced apart from a power line 19c by a distance (see fig. 13).
- 18. Regarding claim 12, Kunikiyo shows that the distance is the width of one of the plurality of interconnect structures (e.g. 21a).
- 19. Regarding claim 22 (as understood) Kunikiyo (e.g. fig. 9) shows a semiconductor configuration for dissipating heat away from a semiconductor device having a plurality of power bus lines, comprising: a semiconductor substrate 1; and a plurality of interconnect structures (28b, 20b, 28c, 20c), each of the interconnect structures having at least one via stack, the interconnect structure disposed on the substrate and in contact therewith and extending through the semiconductor device, the interconnect structures for dissipating heat through the substrate wherein each of the plurality of

Art Unit: 2826

interconnect structures are alternatively spaced from a serpentine power line 25b by a distance (col. 9/lls. 1-6 & col. 21/lls. 23-30).

- 20. Regarding claim 23 (as understood), Kunikiyo (e.g. fig. 12) shows a semiconductor configuration for dissipating heat away from a semiconductor device having a plurality of power bus lines, comprising: a semiconductor substrate 1 and a plurality of interconnect structure (26a/b, 20a) disposed on the substrate and in contact therewith and extending though the semiconductor device, the interconnect structure for dissipating heat though the substrate (col. 9/lls. 1-9 & col. 21/lls. 40-50), wherein the plurality of interconnect structures are periodically spaced apart along a longitudinal axis of the plurality of power lines 28A by a distance.
- 21. Regarding claim 24 (as understood), Kunikiyo (e.g. fig. 12) shows a method for forming a semiconductor configuration for dissipating heat away from a semiconductor device having a plurality of power bus lines, comprising: providing a semiconductor substrate 1, and a forming plurality of interconnect structures (26a/b, 20a) disposed on the substrate and in contact therewith and extending through the semiconductor device, the interconnect structures for dissipating heat through the substrate (col. 9/lls. 1-6 & 21/lls. 40-50) wherein the plurality of interconnect structures are formed within a plurality of power bus lines 28A.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 22. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2826

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 23. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 24. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kunikiyo (US 6,717,267).
- 25. Regarding claim 7, Kunikiyo teaches most aspects of the instant invention including an interconnection structure having a width (i.e., design variable col. 15/lls. 24-41), but does not disclose that the interconnect structure is from about 0.1 to 10 micrometers. Nonetheless, the specification contains no disclosure of either the critical nature of the claimed arrangement or any unexpected results arising therefrom. Where patentability is said to be based upon particular chosen dimensions or upon another variable recited in a claim, the applicant must show that the chosen dimensions are critical. In re Woodruff, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Also, the specific width claimed by applicant, i.e., from about 0.1 to 10 micrometers, absent any criticality, is only considered to an optimum value of the interconnect width structure disclosed by the Prior Art that a person having ordinary skill in the art would

Art Unit: 2826

have been able to determine using routine experimentation based, among other things, on the desired accuracy, manufacturing costs, etc. (see In re Boesch, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980)), and since neither non-obvious nor unexpected results, i.e., results which are different in kind and not in degree from the results of the prior art, will be obtained as long as an interconnect structure is used as already suggested by the Prior Art.

- 26. Claims 2 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kunikiyo (US 6,717,267) in view of Khan et al. (US 6,853,070).
- 27. Regarding claims 2 and 25, Kunikiyo shows most aspects of the instant invention including a substrate but does not disclose a heat sink in contact with the substrate. Nevertheless, Khan (e.g. fig. 2A) shows a mounting structure including a heat sink 110/134 in contact with the substrate 102. According to Kahn this type of mounting structure provides an improved thermal, mechanical and electrical performance because the thermal stress is reduced due to a matched thermal coefficient (col. 1/lls. 52-67; col. 2/lls. 1-6 and col. 3/lls. 14-21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to mount the device disclosed by Kunikiyo in the mounting structure disclosed by Khan which includes a heat sink in contact with the substrate to provide a semiconductor package having a reduce thermal stress in order to improve the thermal, mechanical and electrical performance of the package.

Art Unit: 2826

Allowable Subject Matter

28. Claims 13-21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

- 29. Applicant's arguments filed 10/06/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- 30. Applicant argues that the prior art does not teach that the plurality of interconnects structures are disposed within a power line. Nevertheless, Kunikiyo (e.g. fig. 12) shows that the interconnections (26a,b and 29A) are disposed within a power line 28A. Note that 28A is connected to a power supply by the plug 72 (col. 20/lls. 38-42 & 21/lls. 40-50).
- 31. Regarding applicant argument that Kunikiyo does not show that the plurality that each of the plurality of bridges is alternatively spaced apart from a serpentine power line by a distance. Nevertheless, the examiner has interpreted that the limitation "bridges" is a typographical error and what applicant means is that the plurality of interconnect structures is alternatively spaced apart from a serpentine power line by a distance. In that regards, Kunikiyo shows this limitation (see above rejection). Applicant argues that dummy interconnection 25a is not a power line. However, the interconnection 25a can be labeled as a power line since Kunikiyo clearly teaches that it can be connected to a power supply (col. 21/lls. 23-30).

Art Unit: 2826

32. Applicant argues that Kunikiyo does not show that "the plurality of interconnect structures are periodically spaced apart along a longitudinal axis of the plurality of power lines. Nevertheless, Kunikiyo (e.g. fig. 12) shows interconnect structures (26a/b, 20a) that are periodically spaced apart along a longitudinal axis of the plurality of power lines 28A by a distance.

33. Applicant argues that Kunikiyo does not show that "the plurality of interconnect structures are formed within the plurality of power bus lines. However, Kunikiyo (e.g. fig. 12) shows that plurality of interconnect structures (26a/b, 20a) are formed within a plurality of power bus lines 28A.

Conclusion

- 34. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
- 35. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.
- 36. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leonardo Andújar whose telephone number is 571-272-

Application/Control Number: 10/829,583

Art Unit: 2826

1912. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon through Thu from 9:00 AM to 7:30 PM EST.

- 37. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J. Flynn can be reached on 571-272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.
- 38. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Track &

Leonardo Andújar Primary Examiner Page 10

Art Unit 2826